

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-20 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 7, and 15 being the independent claims.

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner has stated that the phrases "the status of the lock on the primary page" and "the status of the lock on the mirror page" lack antecedent basis.

Claim 17 has been amended and broadened herein, such that the phrase "the status of the lock on the primary page" has been amended to read "a status of the lock on the primary page," and the phrase "the status of the lock on the mirror page" has been amended to read "a status of the lock on the mirror page." The amendments to Claim 17 have accommodated the rejection for the claim. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 7-9 and claims 15-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Beizer et al. (US Patent No. 6,240,414, hereinafter Beizer Patent). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner refers to FIG. 3D of the Beizer Patent to support the rejection of Claim 7. FIG. 3D of the Beizer Patent provides a flowchart of the reconciliation of a single-valued data element which is added or updated by a user in an environment

where multiple users may be accessing the same file. Beizer Patent at Col. 7, Line 25-27. The method described in FIG. 3D compares a data element within an updated work folder to the current master copy of the work folder. The individual data element is examined to see if any changes have been made by comparing the updated work folder to the original copy of the work folder. Beizer Patent at Col. 7, Line 36-37. The comparison is done by comparing the edited data element in the updated work folder to the existing data element in the current master copy.

The process described in FIG. 3D of the Beizer Patent differs significantly from the process described in Claim 7 of the present invention. In Claim 7, a write counter value associated with a primary page is compared to a write counter value of an associated mirror page. The write counter value is not an individual data element within the page, rather it is a value that represents whether changes have occurred to the page. ~~The Beizer Patent does not disclose the use of comparing a write counter value, rather the Beizer Patent compares each individual data element to determine whether a data element has changed.~~ In fact, the Beizer Patent teaches away from claim 7 in that the present invention provides an efficient method for comparing pages to determine whether a change has occurred without examining each and every data element within a page, whereas the Beizer Patent describes an approach that requires each and every data element within a page to be examined.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Beizer patent does not disclose or suggest each and every element in Applicant's claim 7. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element set forth in the claim is found in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131. Because at least the above discussed element of independent claim 7 is nowhere disclosed in the Beizer patent the Beizer patent cannot render unpatentable independent claim 7. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

Because each dependent claim incorporates all of the elements of the independent claim from which it depends, as well as additional features, the above arguments apply *a fortiori* to the dependent claims. Thus, claims 8-14 are also patentable over the Beizer patent. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 has also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Beizer Patent. The Examiner stated in the Office Action that the Beizer Patent discloses individual computer systems, and that the lock as set forth in claim 15 is recited as an option, and therefore does not necessarily limit claim 15 of the present invention. As amended herein, a lock is an element of claim 15 and does carry patentable weight. Because the Beizer patent does not disclose a lock, the Beizer patent cannot render unpatentable independent claim 15. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

Because each dependent claim incorporates all of the elements of the independent claim from which it depends, as well as additional features, the above arguments apply *a fortiori* to the dependent claims 16-20, which depend on claim 15. Thus, claims 16-20 are also patentable over the Beizer patent. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael D. Specht".

Michael Specht
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 54,463

Date: 11/13/03

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

SKGF_DC1:198974.1